



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,234	09/25/2003	Neil Rhodes	2003P14811US	8197

28524 7590 07/20/2010
SIEMENS CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY DEPARTMENT
170 WOOD AVENUE SOUTH
ISELIN, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

BRUCKART, BENJAMIN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2446

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

07/20/2010

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/671,234
Filing Date: September 25, 2003
Appellant(s): RHODES ET AL.

Thomas J. Burton,
Reg. No. 47,464
For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 7-1-10 appealing from the Office action mailed 2-1-10.

(1) Real Party in Interest

The examiner has no comment on the statement, or lack of statement, identifying by name the real party in interest in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The following is a list of claims that are rejected and pending in the application:

Claims 1-20 are pending and rejected.

No claims objected.

No claims allowed.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The examiner has no comment on the summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The examiner has no comment on the appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal. Every ground of rejection set forth in the Office action from which the appeal is taken (as modified by any advisory actions) is being maintained by the examiner except for the grounds of rejection (if any) listed under the subheading "WITHDRAWN REJECTIONS." New grounds of rejection (if any) are provided under the subheading "NEW GROUNDS OF REJECTION."

(7) Claims Appendix

The examiner has no comment on the copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the appellant's brief.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0023874 by Prokupets et al

5815664	Asano	7-1998
6144736	Koenig et al	11-2000

U.S. Patent Publication No. 2006/0114842 by Miyamoto et al.

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1, 2, 7, 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano.

Regarding claim 1, the Prokupets reference teaches a data transmission system for a facility (Prokupets: Fig. 1) comprising:

- a first network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24) including;
- a number of critical devices disposed within the facility (Prokupets: page 3, para 24); and
- at least one first computer workstation operably coupled to said number of critical devices via said first network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 12);
- at least one second computer workstation (Prokupets: Fig. 2, tag 24);

The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach a router to configure to receive, store and forward data packets.

However, the Asano reference teaches an isolating router coupling said first network to a second network and operable to isolate said first network from data transmission traffic in said second network (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11), the isolating router comprising a router configured to receive and store data packets, and to forward the received data packets (Asano: col. 16, lines 58– col. 17 line 11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

Art Unit: 2446

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

Regarding claim 2, the data transmission system of claim 1, wherein:

said first network is a fire control network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24);

said number of critical devices include fire control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24); and

said first computer workstation implements software configured to receive data from and transmit data to said fire control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24; events and commands).

Regarding claim 7, the data transmission system of claim 1, wherein:

said second network includes a corporate network, independent of said first network, which includes workstations capable of broadcast transmissions (Prokupets: page 1, para 1); and

said isolating router is operable to block said broadcast transmissions to said first network (Prokupets: page 1, para 4; Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11).

Regarding claim 14, the Prokupets reference teaches a data communication system for a facility comprising a first network and a second network connected by a router (Prokupets: Fig. 1), the first network including a first plurality of work stations (Prokupets: Fig. 1; page 3, para 24), a second plurality of work stations (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 26, 30), the first plurality of workstations including only building system workstations, the second plurality of work stations including only non-fire safety related building system workstations and non-building system workstations (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 12; page 3, para 21, 24), and wherein the router enables communication between the non-fire related building system workstations and the first plurality of workstations.

The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach an IP router.

Art Unit: 2446

However, the Asano reference teaches an IP router coupling said first network to said second network and operable to isolate said first network from data transmission traffic in said second network (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11), and the router is operable to disable communication between the non-building system workstations and the first plurality of workstations (Asano: col. 16, lines 58– col. 17 line 11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

Regarding claim 15, the data communication system of claim 14 wherein at least one building system work station is a fire safety system workstation connected to one of a plurality of fire safety system devices (Prokupets: page 5, para 34-35).

Regarding claim 16, the data communication system of claim 14 wherein the first plurality of workstations includes at least one fire safety system workstation and at least one non-fire building system work station (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 18a, tag 30, tag 24; page 4, para 28).

Regarding claim 17, the data communication system of claim 14 wherein at least one of the non-fire building system workstations is operably connected to heating ventilation and air conditioning system devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22a).

Claims 3, 4, 8-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No 20060114842 by Miyamoto et al in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,736 by Koenig et al.

Regarding claims 3 and 4, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data transmission system of claim 2. The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

Art Unit: 2446

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches an Ethernet switch used to isolate a first network from a second network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed devices.

However, the Koenig reference teaches using one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards on hardware (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 8, the modified Prokupets reference teaches a data transmission system for use in a facility (Prokupets: Fig. 1) comprising:

- a first network including a number of fire control devices and a number of fire safety workstations operably coupled to said fire control devices and operable to implement software for maintaining and controlling said fire control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 22c; page 3, para 24);

- a number of building control devices and a number of building automation workstations operably coupled to said building control devices and operable to implement software for maintaining and controlling said building control devices (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 26, 30).

The Prokupets reference teaches fails to teach an IP router.

However, the Asano reference teaches an isolating router coupling said first network to said second network and operable to isolate said first network from data transmission traffic in

Art Unit: 2446

said second network (Asano: col. 17, lines 1-11) in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the invention of Prokupets to include an isolating router that processes packets as taught by Asano in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33)

The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches an Ethernet switch used to isolate a first network from a second network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed.

However, the Koenig reference teaches using UL certification on hardware (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 9, the data transmission system of claim 8, wherein said building automation workstations include a database server workstation and at least one database client workstation (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tags 14, 30).

Regarding claim 10, the data transmission system of claim 9, wherein database server workstation is connected within said first sub-network (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 12).

Art Unit: 2446

Regarding claim 11, modified Prokupets reference the data transmission system of claim 10.

The Prokupets reference fails to teach standards on equipment.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling uses than at least some workstations connected outside the first sub-network (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 12, modified Prokupets reference the data transmission system of claim 11.

The Prokupets reference fails to teach standards on equipment.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling uses (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 13, modified Prokupets reference the data transmission system of claim 12.

The Prokupets reference fails to teach standards on equipment.

However, the Koenig reference teaches a meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for information technology equipment for fire protective signaling uses (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Art Unit: 2446

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Claims 5-6, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No 20060114842 by Miyamoto et al.

Regarding claim 5, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data transmission system of claim 1. The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches a second network includes a building control network which includes a second Ethernet switch operably coupled to a number of building control devices independent of said operationally critical devices (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

Regarding claim 6, the data transmission system of claim 5, wherein:

said second network includes a corporate network, independent of said building control network, which includes workstations capable of broadcast transmissions (Prokupets: Fig. 1, tag 30, 26); and

said isolating router is operable to block said broadcast transmissions to said first network (Prokupets: page 1, para 4).

Regarding claim 20, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data communication system of claim 1. The modified Prokupets fails to teach Ethernet connections.

Art Unit: 2446

However, the Miyamoto reference teaches a first network comprises at least one Ethernet network and the second network comprises at least one Ethernet network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6) in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network (Miyamoto: page 1, para 6).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include an Ethernet switch to isolate one network from another as taught by Miyamoto in order to protect a network from the broadcasts of another network.

Claims 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by U.S. Patent Publication No. 20030023874 by Prokupets et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,815,664 by Asano in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,144,736 by Koenig et al.

Regarding claim 18, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data communication system of claim 14.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for fire protective signaling (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

Regarding claim 19, the modified Prokupets reference teaches the data communication system of claim 14.

The modified Prokupets reference fails to teach UL listed.

However, the Koenig reference teaches meeting one or more standards-issuing agencies publicly available standards for information technology equipment for fire protective signaling

Art Unit: 2446

(Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45) in order to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to create the data transmission system as taught by modified Prokupets to include a UL standard on the hardware to obtain safety compliance and dramatically increase long term reliability (Koenig: col. 17, lines 38-45).

(10) Response to Argument

The Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary (third edition) defines a network as "a group of computers and associated devices that are connected by communication facilities."

It is also held that devices may belong to more than one network at one time.

On page 10 of the brief, appellant argues Prokupets does not couple a first network and a second network.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner relies on Prokupets to teach a first network and devices that include critical devices.

Prokupets teaches a first network in Figure 1, tag 22. Critical devices are shown and described in Fig. 1, specifically tag 22c and page 3, para 24. The devices and systems are interconnected by means of network tag 20. Computer networks can comprise any number of devices and be broken down into smaller networks of devices, see tag 22 or tag 18 where devices are networked together by type (Facility Protection Systems or Information Systems).

A first network is shown and demonstrated by the Figure and by way of communication and through tag 20 and page 3, para 21 where "Network 20 represents any typical computer network, such as LAN, WAN or Internet, in which each component in the network has an IP address."

Figures 1 and 2 illustrate the security server monitors and logs all events from devices on the network and then sends that data to 'alarm monitoring client systems' which in real time can respond and communicate with security server 12. The clients do not communicate directly with the devices, only by way of commands through the security server 12 do they perform network functions. Figures 1 and 2 demonstrate the disconnect between the 'alarm monitoring client systems' and the devices such as critical devices.

While Prokupets does not explicitly teach a second network, the examiner asserts that based on the definition presented above from the Microsoft Press Computer Dictionary, the communications between the output device and the security server and 'alarm monitoring client systems' by way of the output devices 16 constitutes a second network, "alarm monitoring client systems ... receive messages by email, pager or personal digital assistant." Messages sent by pager or mobile device illustrate a second network (page 5, para 36). Page 5, para 37 of Prokupets also shows another device that contains the HR database that is coupled with the security server. The communication between these two devices also constitutes a second network as described in the definition above. This meets the claim limitations because the first and second networks are merely defined by their inclusion of devices and not by type, function or features.

Because the second network is not explicitly mentioned in Prokupets, the examiner relies on Asano.

Instead, Asano is relied upon to teach the second network col. 17, lines 1-11. Asano teaches a first network and a second network connected by an isolating router starting in col. 16, lines 58- col. 17, line 11, "a first network 10 is communicable with a second network 20 via the IP network. A plurality of hosts ... are connected to the first network 10. The second network ... may be any network connected to the IP network" describing Fig. 2. The router 30 is described in col. 17 to show the isolating features by restricting and delivering messages through its translation steps.

Appellant does not argue these features are not taught by the Asano reference but argues the motivation to combine Prokupets with Asano.

On page 11 of the brief, appellant argues Prokupets does not teach coupling two different networks in the same manner as a router, let alone in the same manner as the claimed isolating router.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

The examiner does not rely on Prokupets to teach a second network, this is what Asano is produced for (see arguments above).

Appellant argues that the Prokupets server does not have an interface to a second network so it would not be available to modification with Asano.

The examiner disagrees.

First in terms of role, the security server of Prokupets is very similar to the router of Asano. The security server of Prokupet is primarily used to route and process messages between devices such as the 'alarm monitoring client systems' and the devices on the network. Routing and delivering of messages (events, commands) see page 5, para 34, 36. Asano's router is designed to deliver and address messages between different devices on different networks/mediums/protocols as well. In terms of functionality and use, these two devices are similar.

Prokupets security server 12 interfaces with different devices through different devices through a different interface. Figures 1 and 2 again both show separate communications between databases and 'alarm monitoring client systems' with the server. Further para 36 also states the security server 12 can send messages to clients through output devices 16 by email, pager, PDA which shows another device interfacing with security server for delivery of messages via a second network.

The proposed combination would modify Prokupets to add or substitute an isolating router of Asano into Prokupets in order to allow for data isolation between the HR database and the other devices such as the servers of tag 18a and 18e. HR database and HR Computer system are separate and data is only interfaced through the security server (tag 12). Therefore, these devices which could comprise a second network is isolated by functionality.

Art Unit: 2446

By adding the isolating router of Asano to the Prokupets reference, you substitute or additionally add the common functionality and detailed features of the router to the security server to allow controlled data transmission between devices (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

The examiner has produced the citations with motivation appealing the TSM test, KSR supports other rationales to combine the analogous references together.

A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. In the instant case, we are combining the prior art elements of isolating traffic by a router between networks with the network architecture of Prokupet's security server that routes events and commands (traffic) to critical devices.

B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. In the instant case, we are substituting the isolating functionality of a router of Asano with the security server of Prokupets in order to restrict communication and route data between the corresponding devices.

C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices. The well known technique of isolating routers in a computer network architecture as taught by Asano to improve the system of Prokupets in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

D) Applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results. In the instant case, applying a known technique such as restriction and addressing traffic by routing through a router as taught by Asano to the security server of Prokupets which also routes events and commands between clients and devices and systems.

In a broader sense, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, illustrate that router access and control between two networks are easily and readily borrowed, substituted, or applied to the Prokupets reference in order to selectively enable communication and addressing between different networks for access control (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

Both pieces of prior art are in the computer networking field, allowing data to be transmitted between devices with combination to combined. The examiner maintains that the combination of Prokupets with Asano is proper and that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would combine Prokupets with Asano.

Art Unit: 2446

Routers and switches are common entities in networks allowing interfaces between sets of devices and communication protocols. Applicant has provided different rationale, not from the references, to support the notion that the references would not be combined. In light of the evidence cited above and repeatedly argued through prosecution, applicant's router is has no special features, use or definition that set it apart from common network router hardware and its use in the environment is not questioned.

On pages 12-13 of the brief, appellant argues there is no reason to combine Prokupets with Asano.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

As the Microsoft computer dictionary defined a network as a group of computers and associated devices, Prokupet connections between the security server and the output device and the security server and the HR database can be interpreted as each a second network. While this is not explicit, it lends itself to the idea that the security server interfaces with different devices apart from one network. Figures 1 and 2 again both show separate communications between databases and 'alarm monitoring client systems' with the server. Further para 36 also states the security server 12 can send messages to clients through output devices 16 by email, pager, PDA which shows another device interfacing with security server for delivery of messages via a second network. This is only mentioned to show the similar operations and setup between Prokupets and Asano.

In terms of role, the examiner has described above the substantially similar role that Prokupets security server performs and all the features in common with the router of Asano.

The proposed combination would modify Prokupets to add or substitute an isolating router of Asano into Prokupets in order to allow for data isolation between the HR database and the other devices such as the servers of tag 18a and 18e. HR database and HR Computer system are separate and data is only interfaced through the security server (tag 12). Therefore, these devices which could comprise a second network is isolated by functionality.

Art Unit: 2446

By adding the isolating router of Asano to the Prokupets reference, you substitute or additionally add the common functionality and detailed features of the router to the security server to allow controlled data transmission between devices (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

The examiner has produced the citations with motivation appealing the TSM test, KSR supports other rationales to combine the analogous references together.

A) Combining prior art elements according to known methods to yield predictable results. In the instant case, we are combining the prior art elements of isolating traffic by a router between networks with the network architecture of Prokupet's security server that routes events and commands (traffic) to critical devices.

B) Simple substitution of one known element for another to obtain predictable results. In the instant case, we are substituting the isolating functionality of a router of Asano with the security server of Prokupets in order to restrict communication and route data between the corresponding devices.

C) Use of known technique to improve similar devices. The well known technique of isolating routers in a computer network architecture as taught by Asano to improve the system of Prokupets in order to selectively enable communication between different networks (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

D) Applying a known technique to a known device ready for improvement to yield predictable results. In the instant case, applying a known technique such as restriction and addressing traffic by routing through a router as taught by Asano to the security server of Prokupets which also routes events and commands between clients and devices and systems.

In a broader sense, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, illustrate that router access and control between two networks are easily and readily borrowed, substituted, or applied to the Prokupets reference in order to selectively enable communication and addressing between different networks for access control (Asano: col. 4, lines 25-33).

Both pieces of prior art are in the computer networking field, allowing data to be transmitted between devices with combination to combined. The examiner maintains that the combination of Prokupets with Asano is proper and that a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would combine Prokupets with Asano.

On page 13 of the brief, appellant argues claims 2 and 7 for the same reasons as claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Appellant has presented no new arguments; therefore the examiner maintains that claims 2 and 7 remain rejected based on the arguments and rationales addressed above with respect to claim 1.

On page 14 of the brief, appellant argues claim 14 which is distinguished from arguments of claim 1 because it recites "a first plurality of workstations."

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

First the definition of a workstation according to the "IEEE 100 The Authoritative Dictionary of IEEE Standard Terms" is defined as an input/output device employed to perform applications.

Appellant argues the first network includes a plurality of workstations. The examiner maintains the rejection because Prokupets teaches a plurality of workstations. Prokupets teaches 'alarm monitoring client systems' which are equated to workstations as well as devices on the network that show computing devices monitoring for input and outputting events to the security server. Figure 1 shows more than one (see tags 24 and 30) that can be connected via the network (see tag 20 and page 5, para 36).

Prokupets also teaches other workstations such fire systems, servers, intrusion detection systems all on the first network (See Fig 1).

The workstations are not defined in anyway other than mere existence being communicatively coupled to other devices. Appellant attempts to further define the workstation in dependent claim 15.

The rejection is maintained based on the arguments and rationales answered with respect to claim 1 above.

On page 15 of the brief, appellant argues claims 15-17 for the same reasons as claim 14.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Appellant has presented no new arguments; therefore the examiner maintains that claims 15-17 remain rejected based on the arguments and rationales addressed above with respect to claim 14 and claim 1.

On page 15 of the brief, appellant argues claims 16 which claims ‘the first plurality of workstations includes at least one fire safety system workstation and at least one non-fire building system work station.’

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Appellant argues that claim 15 further defines claim 14 to define that the first plurality of workstations includes at least one fire safety system workstation and at least one non-fire building system work station.

Prokupets teaches this limitation because it shows one fire safety system workstation (see Fire system tag 22c) and one non-fire building system work station (see ‘alarm monitoring client systems’ tags 30 and 24) or intrusion detection system (tag 22b). This meets the overly broad claim language and also reads on the claims in light of the specification (see publication paragraphs 7 and 8) where “supervisory workstations allow an operator to interact with and monitor various devices of the fire safety network.” The intrusion detection system is defined on page 3, para 23 of Prokupets where the intrusion detection systems operates sensors, panels, alarm keypads which are all electrical devices that interface with the security server themselves or through a single interface.

Similarly, the fire system is disclosed in page 3, para 24 where panels interface sensors and other detection devices with the security server. These devices each read on fire safety workstations and non-fire building system work stations.

On page 16 of the brief, appellant argues claims 3-4 for the same reasons of claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Appellant has presented no new arguments; therefore the examiner maintains that claims 3-4 remain rejected based on the arguments and rationales addressed above with respect to claim 1.

On page 16 of the brief, appellant argues claims 8-13 the limitations of “a first fire control Ethernet sub-network including a number of fire control devices” and “a second building control Ethernet sub-network include a number of building control devices” connected by “an isolating router” based on the arguments provided for claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Prokupets teaches a first fire control subnetwork including a number of fire control devices on page 3, para 24 and explained above in explanations of the rejection of claim 16. The fire system is a subnetwork of a plurality sensors, panels, sprinklers which are the devices appellant’s specification recites publication para 4-5 and 38 and Figure 1.

Prokupets teaches a second building control subnetwork including a number of building control devices such as the intrusion detection devices such a sensors, alarm panels, and keypads of the intrusion detection system (tag 22b) defined on page 3, para 23. These devices are building control devices because they control access to elements on the building.

On page 17 of the brief, appellant argues claims 5-6, 20 for the same reason as claim 1.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Art Unit: 2446

Appellant has presented no new arguments; therefore the examiner maintains that claims 5-6, 20 remain rejected based on the arguments and rationales addressed above with respect to claim 1.

On pages 17-18 of the brief, appellant argues claims 18-19 for the same reasons as claim 14.

In response, the examiner respectfully submits:

Appellant has presented no new arguments; therefore the examiner maintains that claims 18-19 remain rejected based on the arguments and rationales addressed above with respect to claim 14 and claim 1.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/Benjamin R Bruckart/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2446

Art Unit: 2446

Conferees:

/Joseph E. Avellino/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2458

/Jeffrey Pwu/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2446